Appl. No. 10/005,713   PATENT
Amdt. sent September 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 are pending.

Drawing objections were made.

Claims 1-3 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Solomon, U.S. Patent No. 6,269,409.

Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Herbert et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,757,919.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solomon as applied to claim 3, and further in view of Toda, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0099301.

As to the drawings, the specification has been amended to address the objections raised in the Office action. No new matter has been added.

Claim 1 recites first and second operating systems (OS's) in a computer system. A first component of an application program executes on the first OS and a second component of the application program executes on the second OS. The first component program receives user input. The second component program selectively performs a command issued by the first component program if execution thereof has been designated as permitted in advance.

Solomon et al. show a UNIX OS (which the Office action allegedly asserts to teach the recited first OS) and a Windows NT OS executing on top of UNIX; the NT OS is allegedly asserted to be the recited second OS. Solomon et al. teach that certain interrupts generated by the underlying machine 502 are intercepted by UNIX. UNIX (the alleged first OS) determines whether to send the interrupt (by way of a system call 510) to the NT OS or not. *Col. 4, lines 39-46.* Solomon et al. therefore do not show or suggest a second component program executing in the second OS selectively performs a command issued by the first component program if execution thereof has been designated as permitted in advance.

Appended claim 12 recites first and second operating systems (OS's) in a computer system. A first application-level program executes in the first OS, and a second-application-level program executes in the second OS. The first application-level program is configured to issue a command to the second component program in response to input received

by a user interface of the first application-level program. Solomon et al. do not show or suggest a first application-level program that executes in the first OS and a second-application-level program executes in the second OS, where the first application-level program issues a command to the second component program in response to input received by a user interface of the first application-level program. Instead, Solomon et al., at best, show that applications can execute in the UNIX OS and applications can execute in the NT OS, but Solomon et al. make no suggestion that applications in each OS communicate with each other.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

George B. F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:cmm
60551630 v1